

Please return to Info Dept in due course.

1

Analysts must grasp this pleasure-meaning-commodity complex, and recent developments in film theory—centered in Britain, with a powerful influence in the United States, around the work of the journal *Screen*, and leading from there into film teaching—have been concerned to pose precisely the problems which arise from such an emphasis. Epitome of "cinema," *Jauss* can perhaps provide a focus for discussion that will allow something of these problems to be understood.

Order is fragile but possible, mistakes are made (Vaughan is simply weak, caught out riving his town, and Brody weak, him; it is something else, call it a shark), but it's—Brody—can redeem them (kill the truck), and better than a screwball romantic myth (Quinn, a vague memory of *Moby Dick*, or any expert [Hooper, the middle-class relic], or which *jaws* is the middle-class relic) all the equipment finally defeated by shark).

Other elements extend from this core with a symptomatic richness: as for example, the story Quint tells of the sinking of the *Indanapolis* in shark-infested waters affected by transporting the Hiroshima bomb ("1,100 men went into the water, 350 men came out, anyway we delivered the bomb"). The story's functions to motivate Quint's character as determined shark-killer, but does so excessively, placing—in the play between Quint, Hooper and Brody, as they wait out at sea in the summer of America's final year at war in Vietnam—destruction and conscience and manliness and menace and just doing-the-job (the scene ends with the three men joining in a song—"Show me the way to go home"—interrupted by the shark outside trying to rip into their world).

Semiological description brought consideration of the ways in which meanings are articulated in film. In particular, attention was given to the codes of the image (the construction of iconic signs, problems of denotation and connotation) and to the codes of the arrangement of film in sequences (the definition of syntagmatic units, the structures of film narrative).

This last was a part of the work of the French theoretician Christian Metz whose *Language and Cinema*, published in 1971, is a rigorous investigation of the whole idea of cinema as language, a mapping out of the difficulties involved in the linguistic analogy, in order to give precision to the use of the term "language" in respect of film.

מדי

*signifying* indicates the recognition of film as system or series of systems of meaning, film as articulation. *Practice* stresses the process of this articulation, which it thus refuses to hold under the assumption of notions such as "representation" and "expression"; it takes film as a work of production of meanings and in so doing brings into the analysis the question of the positioning of the subject within that work, its "readers" of the subject, what kind of "relations" of the subject, it constructs. *Specific* represents the need for analysis to understand film in the particularity of the work it engages, the differences it sustains with other signifying practices. This does not, however, entail pulling film towards some aesthetic idea of a pure cinematography on a line with the idea of a pure "literarity" derived in literary criticism from Russian formalism, which has often become a way of avoiding crucial issues of production and ideology in its precise appeal to a technician ("structuralist poetics").

heterogeneity in its particular effects. In particular inscriptions of subject and meaning and ideology. Directed in this way, the study of film is of neither contents nor "form," but, breaking the deadlock of the opposition, of operations, of the process of film and the relations of subjectivity in the process.

In the light of these propositions, let us come back to *laws*, to this particular film. Space will not permit detailed analysis of the movement of its filmic system; one or two fragmentary indications must serve to suggest the terms of that movement, and lead on to some consideration of machine and industry, indications that will be developed from the opening shots of the film.

Evening cut to the girl who is revealed as the object of his gaze, followed by a cut to a high angle shot down onto the parrain establishing its overall space. Then comes run down to the sea, the girl shedding her clothes as the boy stumbles drunkenly after her as she swims out, the boy collapses; a underwater shot, now moving up to the surface between the girl's legs, precedes the shark's attack; the next morning the boy wakes, sits up into frame as we look on with him on the empty ocean.

מדי

Thus, for example, the presence of the shark is given in the very first shot with its violent underwater movement tied to no human point of view, and the underwater shot is then used in the first part of the film to signify the imminence of attack: we are placed as the shark as it rises to the girl and, later, to the little boy on the float.

onto the shark: the girl leads the boy as she strips, he follows with "I'm coming, I'm definitely coming"; when she is attacked he lies on the beach moaning again "I'm coming, I'm coming," (the novel has a report of the attack held up while the detective patrolman finishes reading a story about a woman who castrates an assailant with a knife secreted in her hair).

The stress on dismemberment—after the girl, all the victims are male and the focus is on losing legs—finds its resonance in this context, as too does the scene where Quig and Hooper compare shark wounds (Quig drink to their legs!), as again does the apparently gratuitous image of the old man in the bathing cap with hanging breasts who comes to haunt Brody with his fear of the water.

Such indications begin to show something of the multiple series working over the narrative in a film text, series that combine across the different matters of expression and content, repetitions, turns. In fact, film potentially a veritable flux of affects, plurality of indestinies, and narrative functions to contain that affectivity, which is its "re-released" as "excess", "disturbance" figure"—symptomatic demonstrations of the work of containment.

47

1

The founding of vision in the subject as the perspective of intelligibility is crucial. Cinema is implicated in a founding ideology of vision as truth (Lumiere aims "to reproduce life itself") but film, in its flux, can also produce discontinuities, disruptions, "shocks". Hence, from the start, there is a need to reconstruct that truth of vision, to establish ways for holding a film's relations as the coherence of the subjective—continuity techniques, matches, 30 degree and 180 degree rules, codes of framing, and so on.

*Jaws*, moreover, has the whole film saturated in the images flickeringly reflected on Brody's glasses as he skims through pages of the books about sharks, occasionally fixing a corresponding image—the whole film except, precisely for Brody, the vision that comes, the film's "resolution."

meaning but equally on the pleasure cinema, this yielding the return that allows the perpetuation of the industry (which is why part of the meaning of *jams* is to be the most profitable movie); a film is not reducible to its "ideology" but is also the workman over of that ideology in cinema, with the industry dependent on the pleasure of its operation. The problems for film theory today are those of approaching an understanding of the fact of film in these terms.

For the theory has continually to learn from those practices, which must indeed prove its very edge; as it has too, dialectically, run back into them, a moment of the advance in the transformation of the relations of subject and meaning in film. The study of Hollywood film (*Jaws*) includes its strategies, its frictions, its pleasure, and have an importance in this context—if our study be directed, critically and specifically, to Hollywood film itself as significant practice.

47